

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 50, Chapter 8 Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Grant

PIN	5548	COUNTY	Multiple Counties
APPLICANT	Santa Monica Bay Restoration Authority	AMOUNT REQUESTED	\$430,925
PROJECT TITLE	North Santa Monica Bay Integrated Regional Water Management Plan	TOTAL PROJECT COST	\$2,163,301

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Develop an IRWMP to determine and implement more cost effective and broader-reaching water management solutions in the North Santa Monica Bay Region.

WORK PLAN - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has a detailed and specific work plan that adequately documents the proposal. Weighting factor is 3.

Score: 12

Comment: The proposal includes a work plan with specific work items, schedule and budget. The work plan is implementable but additional detail on task descriptions would have improved the proposal. Deliverables for the appropriate tasks are identified. Work plan budget and schedule are consistent. The budget for the most part is supported. However, it is unclear how "other direct costs" are determined. More points would have been awarded if it was clear how these costs were determined. The proposal does not provide a linkage to the ASBS. The emphasis is on the Malibu Creek and Topanga Creek watersheds which are not tributary to the ASBS.

DESCRIPTION OF REGION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented a detailed and specific description that adequately documents the region. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 4

Comment: The region is defined on watershed boundary and jurisdictional lines. There is no description of the 20 mentioned wetlands. The proposal does not include a discussion of discharges to the ASBS. The proposal could have scored higher if the applicant discussed flow information, habitats, and biological communities in watersheds with an emphasis on the relationship to the ASBS. The applicant provides only a limited description of social, cultural and economic conditions.

OBJECTIVES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific planning objectives. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 6

Comment: The regional planning objectives are described and there is a process described for revisions to these objectives for adoption by the group. However, objectives are not focused on coastal waters and the ASBS. There is also no significant detail on how they relate to the statewide priorities. Proposal could have scored higher if there was a discussion of reducing waste discharges in the ASBS. This is only briefly mentioned in the work plan as "identification and improvement" with no details provided.

INTEGRATION OF WATER MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented how water management strategies will be integrated. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 6

Comment: The applicant does not describe how integration of strategies will benefit or address the large number of ASBS discharges on a time scale more rapid than the TMDL implementation plan. More points would have been awarded had the applicant related the proposed plan to the CCA Program Watershed Action Plan.

IMPLEMENTATION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately detailed plan implementation. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 8

Comment: The applicant is not clear on how success will be monitored and future implementation will be carried out beyond the completion of the plan. The applicant has provided explanation of the existing planning efforts the proposal will draw from but how these will all come together is not provided in any detail. More points would have been awarded if performance measures were more thoroughly addressed and adaptive management mechanisms were considered so that the plan is dynamic.

IMPACTS AND BENEFITS - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately presented and documented the impacts and benefits of the Plan. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 4

Comment: The proposal does not focus on the existing impacts to water quality and the ASBS issues do not seem to be a priority. Discussion focuses more on integration of plans not on how integration will achieve benefits. The proposal does not include a discussion of CEQA or an impact analysis. The benefits are unclear but Task 4 of the work plan does include a benefit assessment.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 50, Chapter 8 Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Grant

DATA AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific data and technical analysis components of the proposal. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 3

Comment: The applicant indicates that in the initial phases of the program a stakeholder group will develop sound data and technical analysis from the many existing technical reports. These activities are not supported by tasks in the work plan. The application contains references to several reports on water quality, but few on storm water management and water supply reliability. In addition, the proposal does not reference or propose to draw data from significant State funded studies that identify the number and location of discharges into the ASBS.

DATA MANAGEMENT - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific data management procedures. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 3

Comment: The proposal provides a comprehensive discussion of proposed report and study development and process for disseminating information to stakeholders. There is limited discussion about how this data management will support statewide data needs. There is also no indication that there are plans to somehow unify data collection, storage, and dissemination mechanisms.

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented stakeholder involvement concerns. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 3

Comment: There is a discussion of the process for involvement of stakeholders in the immediate project area but there is no discussion of including local land use agencies and little effort directed toward those affecting discharges to the ASBS. The process allows for stakeholder input utilizing four different types of stakeholder groups but only one meeting is planned to share the draft plan. More points would have been awarded if there was more information given on how that one meeting allows sufficient participation in the process particularly since the draft IRWMP/ICWMP is scheduled to be completed before any of the work plan items are implemented. The proposal has no mention of environmental justice.

DISADVANTAGE COMMUNITIES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented disadvantaged community concerns. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 2

Comment: The proposal indicates there are no disadvantaged communities in the area but suggests the area provides community based opportunities for the disadvantaged communities from outside the region. It is not clear how the plan would directly benefit them.

RELATION TO LOCAL PLANNING - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented the Plan's relationship to local planning efforts. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 5

Comment: The proposal identifies several local planning documents that will form a foundation for the regional plan and the relationship to the IRWMP.

AGENCY COORDINATION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented agency coordination issues. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 3

Comment: The proposal mentions coordination with State and Federal agencies, but is missing local land use agencies, such as City and County Planning.

TOTAL SCORE: 59